REMARKS

By an Office Action dated May 17, 2004, the Examiner in charge of this application rejected the application but indicated that there was allowable subject matter. Through this amendment, the applicant is attempting to put this case in condition for allowance.

The first issue raised in the Office Action was that the term "KNOCKOUT" is a trademark and is to be used with capitalization and an indication of trademark status. The applicant believes that it has already complied with this requirement. In the Amendment mailed February 11, 2004, the applicant amended the paragraphs on page 6, beginning on lines 3 and 6, to make this precise correction. It is believed that the applicant has already properly entered the change requested by the Examiner.

The second issue raised in the Office Action is a rejection for obviousness-type double patenting over the pending claims 17 and 18 in co-pending S. N. 10/430,497. This rejection can be set aside for now since, as noted by the Examiner, the co-pending application is not a patent and has not, in fact, yet been the subject of examination. The applicant believes the subject matter claimed in that case is distinct from that claimed here, but that issue can be addressed in the co-pending application and need not hold up the allowance of this application.

The third issue raised by the Examiner is a rejection under §112, second paragraph for lack of proper consistency in language between claims 8 and 1. The Examiner's point was well taken, and the applicant has amended claim 1 to add the desired consistency.

The next issue raised in the Office Action is a rejection of some claims under §103 over a combination of references. In the discussion of this rejection, the Examiner noted that the claims would be allowable if amended to recite in the preamble and the final step the unexpected results achieved from the invention. The applicant has done that in this amendment, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 17. This amendment adds language to each claim making it clear that the stem cells will continue to proliferate in an undifferentiated state even without serum in the medium. This concept finds its support in the specification on page 8, in the paragraph beginning on line 8. In that passage, it is noted that in serum free medium lacking FGF, that human stem cells rapidly differentiate in culture. Thus, the language recited in claims 1, 9, 14 and 17, that the stem cells continue to proliferate in culture without serum, recites an unexpected result from the media formulations claimed by the applicant here. Language has been added to the preamble and the last step of each of these claims as suggested by the Examiner.

Lastly, the Examiner also indicated that claims 7 and 13 would be allowable if presented in independent form. That has been done above.

Accordingly, the applicant has addressed each ground of objection raised in the Office Action and a reconsideration of the merits of this patent application is respectfully requested.

The issuance of an allowance for this patent application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas J. Seay
Reg. No. 27,386
Attorney for Applicant
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
P O Box 2113
Madison, WI 53701-2113

TEL 608/251-5000
FAX 608/251-9166

QBMAD\377446.1